

STATINTL

CLANDESTINE SERVICE SENIOR SEMINAR

CRITIQUE

1. As you know, the first four days of the Seminar were designed as a sort of backdrop to the problem-tackling weeks, providing: a. a brief survey of developments since World War II and of present international conditions, with particular emphasis on those forces and trends which pose problems for U. S. national objectives and security; b. a look at ourselves and prospects for the future -- the CS in a changing world; and c. an up-to-date and candid look at "the national security process" and the CS role therein. Did you find this portion of the Seminar useful?

- a. No _____
- b. Yes, to a slight degree _____
- c. Yes, to a moderate degree _____
- d. Yes, to a good degree X
- e. Yes, to an exceptional degree _____

2. Quite apart from the CS Senior Seminar, do you think that a brief (2 or 3 day) seminar on The CS in a Changing World along the same lines as this backdrop portion would be useful and interesting to other senior CS officers?

CRITIQUE (cont.)

Page Two

- a. No _____
- b. Yes, to a slight degree X
- c. Yes, to a moderate degree _____
- d. Yes, to a good degree _____
- e. Yes, to an exceptional degree _____

A bit of this is given in the CSR course, and possibly could be included within other fora. I would hesitate recommending that it stand alone.

3. Unfortunately, agenda changes and other factors beyond our control did not permit the timely dissemination of complete reading kits. Except for receiving reading material in piecemeal fashion, did you find the documents useful to your consideration of the problems discussed?

- a. No _____
- b. Yes, to a slight degree X
- c. Yes, to a moderate degree _____
- d. Yes, to a good degree _____
- e. Yes, to an exceptional degree _____

Much too much. A highly-select few papers most pertinent to each topic would have been better.

4. Do you have any suggestions for changes or improvements in the techniques of the Seminar, e.g., in the method of preparing the papers, the handling of outside contributions by guest speakers, etc.?

Each topic of study suffered from minimal intellectual input in terms of selecting and relating reading materials, speakers and discussion scheduling. Suggest that a single knowledgeable senior officer be made responsible for the planning and handling of each topic, beginning the lines of the first week.

CRITIQUE (cont.)

Page Three

5. Do you have any suggestions for changes and improvements in the administration of the Seminar, including space and location?

Important consideration is a central room of about this size with good acoustics. Suggest that there also be about three smaller rooms close by with typewriters available for drafting work. Recommend that sessions continue to be held at Hqs., not out of town.

6. Do you think the size of the group was appropriate? If not, please explain.

Yes.

7. Do you think that Seminar members were well selected to meet the requirements placed on the Seminar? If not, do you have any suggestions for improving the composition of any such future Seminar?

No. Believe all such seminars should have a nucleus of officers from all area divisions, with supplementary representation from 2-3 staff elements.

CRITIQUE (cont.)

Page Four

8. Did you find the Seminar topics pertinent and challenging?

What topics would you have included as "vital, current problems of the CS?"

CS Structure, and Covert Action Today — Yes.
Non-Official Covert, and Emerging Elites — No.
Believe a good series of topics could be developed on improvement of professionalism within our various operational specialties. Likewise on training programs for CS officers.

9. Do you have any other comments on the Seminar which might be useful as a basis for improvement or modification of any future Seminar?

Believe three weeks should be allotted span, with first week remaining essentially as is but the remaining two weeks being devoted to a single topic. Administratively, it might be helpful to provide a suggested format to the members for the paper desired from them.